



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
MAILED P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

MAR 14 2011

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

SHERIDAN ROSS PC
1560 BROADWAY
SUITE 1200
DENVER CO 80202

In re Application of :
Rieck, et al. :
Application No. 10/541,845 : ON PETITION
Filed: June 27, 2006 :
Attorney Docket No. **1604BPE-17-PUS**

This is a decision on the renewed petition to withdraw the holding of abandonment under 37 CFR 1.181(a), filed March 1, 2011.

The petition is **granted**.

This application was held abandoned December 2, 2010, after no reply was received to the Notice of Allowance and Issue Fee Due mailed September 1, 2010. The notice set forth a statutory period of reply of three months from its mailing date. No response was received within the allowable period and the application became abandoned on December 2, 2010. A Notice of Abandonment was mailed December 15, 2010. A petition under 37 CFR 1.181 was filed on December 30, 2010, and dismissed by a decision mailed January 28, 2011. The instant renewed petition was filed on March 1, 2011. Petitioner maintains that the Office action mailed September 1, 2010, was never received.

When, as in this case petitioner is arguing that an Office communication was not received, petitioner must establish non-receipt of the Office communication in accordance with section 711.03(c) of the *Manual of Patent Examining Procedure* that requires the following:

To minimize costs and burdens to practitioners and the Office, the Office has modified the showing required to establish nonreceipt of an Office action. The showing required to establish nonreceipt of an Office communication must include a statement from the practitioner describing the system used for recording an Office action received at the correspondence address of record with the USPTO. The statement should establish that the docketing system is sufficiently reliable. It is expected that the record would include, but not be limited to, the application number, attorney docket number, the mail date of the Office action and the due date for the response.

Practitioner must state that the Office action was not received at the correspondence address of record, and that a search of the practitioner's record(s), including any file jacket or the equivalent, and the application contents, indicates that the Office action was not received. A copy of the record(s) used by the practitioner where the non-received Office action would have been entered had it been received is required.

A copy of the practitioner's record(s) required to show non-receipt of the Office action should include the master docket for the firm. That is, if a three month period for reply was set in the nonreceived Office action, a copy of the master docket report showing all replies docketed for a date three months from the mail date of the nonreceived Office action must be submitted as documentary proof of nonreceipt of the Office action. If no such master docket exists, the practitioner should so state and provide other evidence such as, but not limited to, the following: the application file jacket; incoming mail log; calendar; reminder system; or the individual docket record for the application in question.

Petitioner has met the burden of proof as established by Section 711.03(c)(II) of the MPEP. The holding of abandonment is, therefore, withdrawn.

The issue fee, publication fee, and Form PTOL-85b are noted as having been received on December 20, 2010.

The application file is being forwarded to the Office Data Management for further processing.

Questions concerning this decision should be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3222.

/Kenya A. McLaughlin/

Kenya A. McLaughlin
Petitions Attorney
Office of Petitions